UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,079	04/22/2005	Jamila Najib	BJS-3665-129	9192
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 04/07/200 NDERHYE. PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	BARKER, MICHAEL P		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/520,079	NAJIB ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MICHAEL P. BARKER	1626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/14	1/2008 Amd after Non-Ein					
,—	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01/14/2008</u> , <u>Amd after Non-Fin.</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
	/ 					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
·	x parto Quayro, 1000 0.5. 11, 10	,				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>69-90,92-99,101,102 and 104-106</u> is/a	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>69-90,92-99,101,102 and 104-106</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>69-90,92-99,101,102 and 104-106</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
5, <u> </u>						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 January 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u> </u>	muianitu umdan 35 H.C.C. \$ 110/a)	\ (d\ a v (f\)				
	2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
·— ·— ·—	a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☑ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						

Claims 69-90, 92-99, 101, 102, and 104-106 are pending in this Application.

Response to Remarks

Applicant requests clarification regarding the scope of the subject matter searched. The

subject matter was submitted to the PTO's in-house structural search team. From the document

titled "Examiner's search strategy and results" (10/01/2007) available in PAIR, it appears as if

the entirety of Group III has been searched and that the inclusion of anything less than every

claim representing Group III was an error. Thus, Claims 69-90, 92-99, 101, 102, and 104-106

are pending, and each appears to read on the elected subject matter, i.e. X_6 is O and X_2 is not

bound to carbon 3 of the propene chain.

The Restriction Requirement was reiterated in the Office Action dated 10/12/2007 and

maintained. The use of the word, "maintained" is confusing since it does not expressly indicate

finality. Thus, to clarify, the Restriction Requirement is hereby made final.

Applicant's amendments, filed 01/14/2008, are acknowledged. The rejection put forth

under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph over **Claims 100-103** is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

ODP

The ODP rejection made in the Office Action dated 10/12/2007 should have included all

claims representing Group III. Thus, the ODP should now include Claims 69-90, 92-99, 101,

102, and 104-106. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection put forth in the Office

Application/Control Number: 10/520,079 Page 3

Art Unit: 1626

Action dated 10/12/2007 is hereby maintained. The newly added claims, **Claims 104-106**, are likewise rejected for the same reasons.

The Examiner would like to apologize for the confusing Applicant (as well as the Examiner) by misconstruing the grouping of the claims both in this rejection and in the Scope of the Subject Matter Searched.

$112 - 1^{st}$ paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 69-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because while the specification is **enabling for** *compounds of formula (I)*, *optical and geometric isomers*, *racemates, tautomers, and salts thereof*, it **does not enable** *hydrates thereof*. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In the case *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have need described. They are:

- 1. the nature of the invention,
- 2. the state of the prior art,
- 3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
- 4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
- 5. the presence or absence of working examples,
- 6. the breadth of the claims,
- 7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
- 8. the level of the skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/520,079 Page 4

Art Unit: 1626

Claims 69-73 are drawn to compounds of formula (I), as well as optical and geometric isomers, racemates, tautomers, salts, hydrates, and mixtures thereof. According to Byrn, et al., "the occurrence of hydrated or solvated crystal forms, crystals in which solvent molecules occupy regular positions in the crystal structure, is widespread but *by no means universal among drug substances*." (emphasis added). Byrn, et al. "Solid State Chemistry of Drugs", 2d ed., SSCI, Inc., Ch. 10 Polymorphs, pp. 232-247, 232 (1999). Most drug crystals that fall into the category of solvates are hydrates. *Id.* at 236.

While the level of skill in pharmacology and organic chemistry is exceedingly high, there is no absolute predictability as to which solvates and/or hydrates will function as intended. Byrn notes that the water molecule is particularly suited to fill structural voids, due to its small size. *Id.* In hydrated crystal structures, water molecules bind to other water molecules but also to any available functional group, i.e. carbonyls, amines, alcohols, and many others which are capable of accepting or donating an active hydrogen atom to form hydrogen bonds. *Id.* Also, the behavior of hydrates of pharmaceuticals is unpredictable due to dehydration prior to melting, and cracking during dehydration. *Id.* at 234. Too, hydrates and solvates may only be formed under certain conditions, dependent upon the compounds sought to be crystallized. Such a process is not a given in pharmacology and requires a great deal of research, with no guarantee of success.

Furthermore, the stability of solvates and hydrates is not altogether predictable, wherein said stability directly affects the properties of a given molecule. This lack of stability means a hydrate or solvate, if found to possess similar properties as the target compound, may not function as intended *in vivo*. Such facts lead to the conclusion that more that a mere recitation is needed in order to support a claim to solvates and hydrates. Creating functional solvates and

hydrates with the same properties as the mother-compound is by no means routine, thus there must be a showing sufficient to satisfy the enablement requirement.

In the instant case, the Specification provides no guidance as to particular hydrates of formula (I). There are no examples given that Applicant has determined the necessary solvents for even one of the 1000s of compounds encompassed by the genus that is formula (I). There are no determinations as to whether and which hydrates or solvates would function as intended, as useful in the treatment of cerebral ischemia, hemorrhagic stroke, or neuroprotection.

The level of difficulty required to produce functional hydrates and solvates is extremely high. The level of skill in pharmacology/organic chemistry is also very high. However, despite such a high level of skill in the requisite art, the creation of hydrates and solvates is unpredictable to the extent that undue experimentation is required in order to make and use hydrates and solvates of the claimed compounds. There is an insufficient showing in the Specification, or the state of the art does not acknowledge that the hydrates and solvates of the claimed compounds can be created via routine experimentation. Therefore, Applicant's Specification does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims. Applicant may overcome this rejection by deleting "hydrate, hydrate of the salt, or solvate" from the language of Claims 69-73.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Barker whose telephone number is (571) 272-4341. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM- 5:00 PM. If attempts to

Application/Control Number: 10/520,079 Page 6

Art Unit: 1626

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K.

McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699. The unofficial fax phone for this group are (571)

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is viable through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael P Barker/

Examiner, Art Unit 1626

/Rebecca L Anderson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626